



CGHC010270632026

2026:CGHC:35482-DB

NAFR

ROHIT
KUMAR
CHANDRA
Digitally signed
by ROHIT
KUMAR
CHANDRA

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

WA No. 726 of 2026

- 1** - State of Chhattisgarh Through- The Secretary Department of Employment Training Mahanadi Bhawan Atal Nagar New Raipur District- Raipur (C.G.) (Respondent No.1)
- 2** - Secretary Department General Administration Mahanadi Bhawan Mantralaya Atal Nagar, New Raipur, District- Raipur (C.G.) (Respondent No2)
- 3** - Director Directorate Of Employment And Training Indravati Bhawan Block-4 First Floor New Raipur District- Raipur (C.G.) (Respondent No3)
- 4** - Joint Director (Training) Industrial Training Institute Raipur, District Raipur (C.G.) (Respondent No 4)
- 5** - Chhattisgarh Professional Examination Board (Vyapam) Through- Secretary Vyapam Bhawan North Block- Sector-19 Nava Raipur Atal Nagar Raipur District- Raipur (C.G.) (Respondent No.5)

... Appellants

versus

Smt. Abhisarika Singh W/o Shri Darmendra Singh Aged About 39 Years
R/o Dr. Pathak Gali Ward No. 27, Kedarpur Ambikapur, District Surguja
(C.G.) (Petitioner No1)

... Respondent

For Appellants/State	: Mr. Saumya Rai, Dy. Govt. Advocate
For Respondent	: Mr. Priyanshu Gupta, Advocate

Hon'ble Shri Ramesh Sinha, Chief Justice
Hon'ble Shri Ravindra Kumar Agrawal, Judge

Judgment on Board

Per Ramesh Sinha, Chief Justice

12.08.2026

- 1 Heard Mr. Saumya Rai, learned Deputy Government Advocate,
appearing for the State/appellants as well as Mr. Priyanshu Gupta,

learned counsel for the respondent / writ petitioner on I.A. No. 01 of 2026, which is an application for condonation of delay of 460 days in preferring the instant appeal.

- 2 After hearing learned counsel for the parties and considering the reasons mentioned in the application, we are of the considered opinion that sufficient cause has been shown in the application and accordingly, I.A. No. 01/2026 is allowed and delay of 460 days in filing the appeal is condoned.
- 3 The present writ appeal is preferred assailing the order dated 18.02.2025 passed by the learned Single Judge in WPS No. 1281 of 2025 (***Smt. Abhisarika Singh vs. State of Chhattisgarh and Others***), whereby, the writ petition filed by the writ petitioner/ respondent herein was disposed of by the learned Single Judge.
- 4 It has been pointed out by learned counsel, appearing for the appellants as well as learned counsel appearing for the respondent that in an identical matter, this Bench had dismissed ***WA No. 614/2025 (State of Chhattisgarh & Others vs. Neelam Mashih Tigga and Another)*** vide order dated 19.08.2025, observing as follows :

“9. Rule 8(l)(b) provides that the upper age limit shall be relaxable by five years for candidates belonging to Scheduled Castes, Scheduled Tribes and O.B.C. (Non-Creamy Layer). Rule 8(l)(c) provides relaxation up to ten years for women candidates. A conjoint reading of Rule 8(l)(b) and Rule 8(l)(d) makes it clear that a candidate holding a temporary or permanent post with

the State of Chhattisgarh, applying for another post, should not be more than 38 years of age; however, candidates belonging to SC, ST or OBC categories are entitled to an additional relaxation of five years. Both the Rules and the advertisement further stipulate that even after all permissible relaxations, the maximum age shall not exceed 45 years. Thus, a reserved category candidate is entitled to the same relaxation available to a general category candidate plus an additional five years' relaxation on account of his caste.

10. In the present case, the respondent No. 1/writ petitioner, being a member of the Scheduled Tribe community, was entitled to such relaxation, and therefore, rejection of his candidature solely on the ground of age was unsustainable. The learned Single Judge has rightly quashed the rejection and directed the authorities to consider his claim for appointment to the post of Training Officer.

11. Considering the pleadings in the writ appeal, submissions of the parties, and the findings recorded by the learned Single Judge, we are of the opinion that no illegality, irregularity or jurisdictional error has been committed warranting interference by this Court.

12. Accordingly, the writ appeal, being devoid of merit, is dismissed. ”

They further submit that the SLP preferred by the appellants in WA No. 614 of 2025 being SLP (Civil) Diary No(s). 28907 of 2026 has already been dismissed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court vide order dated 22.07.2026 and the order passed in WA No. 614/2025

has been accordingly affirmed, as such, since the facts and issue involved in the present case is identical to that of **WA No. 614/2025**, this appeal may also be dismissed in the same terms.

- 5 Having considered the rival submissions made by learned counsel for the parties and having gone through the materials on record, it is evident that the facts and issue involved in this appeal is identical to WA No. 614/2025 and further considering the fact that the SLP preferred against the order passed in WA No.614/2025 being SLP (Civil) Diary No(s). 28907 of 2026 has already been dismissed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court vide order dated 22.07.2026, this Court deems it appropriate not to take a view other than what has been taken in WA No. 614/2025.
- 6 Accordingly, the present appeal is **dismissed** in terms of the order dated 19.08.2025 passed in **WA No. 614/2025**.

Sd/-

(Ravindra Kumar Agrawal)
Judge

Sd/-

(Ramesh Sinha)
Chief Justice